



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/018,502	02/25/2002	Kimmo Narkilahti	089229.00007	2649
32294	7590	06/24/2009	EXAMINER	
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP. 8000 TOWERS CRESCENT DRIVE 14TH FLOOR VIENNA, VA 22182-6212			RAMPURIA, SHARAD K	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617		PAPER		
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/24/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/018,502		NARKILAHTI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
SHARAD RAMPURIA	2617		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various Claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each Claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight et al. [GB 2327175] in view of Kimoto; Takashi et al. [US 6115611 A1].

Regarding Claim 1, Knight discloses method for determining the behavior patterns of users of a telecommunication system on the basis of information collected from the telecommunication system, (Pg.1; 26-35), the method comprising;

Defining at least one variable or a combination of variables of the telecommunication, (Pg.4; 8-29)

Filtering user-specific information corresponding to the defined at least one variable or a combination of variables from the information collected from the telecommunication system, (Pg.4; 31-Pg.5; 34, Pg.3; 16-Pg.4; 6)

Knight fails to disclose classifying the users of the telecommunication system based on the filtered user-specific information into various classes indicative of a user's behavior patterns during use of the telecommunication system. However, KIMOTO teaches in an analogous art, that the classifying the users of the telecommunication system based on the filtered user-specific information into various classes indicative of a user's behavior patterns during use of the telecommunication system. (e.g. providing hierarchical information based on user's group; Col.44; 43-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include classifying the users of the telecommunication system based on the filtered user-specific information into various classes indicative of a user's behavior patterns during use of the telecommunication system in order to provide a method for providing information based on the subscriber's position in a wireless mobile communications system.

Regarding Claim 2, Knight discloses a method according to Claim 1, characterized in that said user-specific information is filtered from the telecommunication system in real time. (Pg.4; 15-21)

Regarding Claim 3, Knight disclose a method according to Claim 1, characterized in that after said filtering of information the filtered information is saved (3; fig.1) for later analysis. (Pg.3; 20-24)

Regarding Claim 4-6, Knight discloses all the particulars of the Claim except after the classification; statistical analysis is carried out on the classified information. However, KIMOTO teaches in an analogous art, that a method according to Claim 1, characterized in that after the classification; statistical analysis is carried out on the classified information e.g. providing hierarchical information based on user's group; Col.44; 43-52).

Regarding Claim 7, Knight discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the classifying comprises classifying the users into the various classes indicative of a user's classes of behavior patterns defined in connection with the definition of variables (Pg.1; line 26-Pg.2; line 18, Pg.3; line 16-34).

Regarding Claim 8, Knight discloses all the particulars of the Claim except the definitions of the classes of behavior patterns used in the classification of users are changed. However, KIMOTO teaches in an analogous art, that a method according to Claim 1,

characterized in that the definitions of the classes of behavior patterns used in the classification of users are changed (e.g. providing hierarchical information based on user's group; Col.44; 43-52).

Regarding Claim 9, Knight discloses all the particulars of the Claim except filtered unclassified information is classified into said new classes of behavior patterns. However, KIMOTO teaches in an analogous art, that a method according to Claim 8, characterized in that said filtered unclassified information is classified into said new classes of behavior patterns (e.g. providing hierarchical information based on user's group; Col.44; 43-52).

Regarding Claim 10, Knight discloses a method according to Claim 1, characterized in that at least one of the variables is the type of contract of the user (Pg.3; 16-34).

Regarding Claim 11, Knight discloses a method according to Claim 1, characterized in that at least one of the variables is the type of system service. (Pg.3; 16-Pg.4; 6)

Regarding Claim 12, Knight disclose a method according to Claim 1, characterized in that said telecommunication system is a mobile communication system (1; fig.1; Pg.1; 7-10)

Claims 13-18 system claims, corresponding to **method** Claims 1-3, 9-10, 12 respectively, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of Claims 1-3, 9-10, 12 respectively, above.

Claims 19-24 system claims, corresponding to **method** Claims 1-3, 9-10, 12 respectively, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of Claims 1-3, 9-10, 12 respectively, above.

Response to Amendments & Remarks

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24, have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharad Rampuria whose telephone number is (571) 272-7870. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F. (8:30-5 EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost can be reached on (571) 272-7023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000 or *EBC@uspto.gov*.

/Sharad Rampuria/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2617